

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action comments were made regarding the adequacy of a previously filed drawing amendment. That issue was attended to, however, on the same day as the stated mailing date of the Office Action. That is, a Supplemental Response was filed electronically on August 30, 2007, in order to overcome the drawing deficiency which was mentioned in the Office Action.

Next, certain objections as to matter of form are set forth in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, wherein certain remedies to those objections were suggested. This is to confirm that all of those suggestions were adopted and that the claims were amended accordingly.

In addition, the claims were rejected as being anticipated by the disclosure of the cited Van Den Hoven reference or as being obvious in view of that reference when combined with the disclosure of the cited Parulski reference (Claims 14 and 19). Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as now presented are patentable over those references for the reasons given herein.

In particular, with respect to the Examiner's rejections of the claims in view of the cited prior art, the claims have been amended, for example, so that independent Claim 13 requires that an image processing apparatus, including a reproducing unit which reproduces a part of a moving image from a storage medium during a predetermined reproduction time, is arranged to determine whether a first button is pressed before the predetermined reproduction time is passed, so that the reproducing unit reproduces not only the part of the moving image but also the remaining part of the moving image, if it is determined that the first button is pressed

before the predetermined reproduction time is passed. This feature of the present invention is supported by the description of the first embodiment (e.g., Fig.3).

The above-noted feature of the present invention is not disclosed by the cited Van Der Hoven reference, that patent describes in column 3 lines 59-64 that “The image collection could also comprise one or more video streams. In that case, the representations could be key frames corresponding to portions of the video stream or streams. Selecting a representation will then result in a corresponding moving image, i.e. the corresponding portion of a video stream, being shown” (emphasis added). That is, the Van Der Hoven patent suggests reproducing a portion of the video stream corresponding to the selected representation but fails to disclose reproducing another portion in addition to the portion of the video stream corresponding to the selected representation. Therefore, Van Der Hoven does not disclose or suggest reproducing not only a part of the moving image but also the remaining part of moving image, if it is determined that a first button is pressed before a predetermined reproduction time is passed, as recited in the amended independent Claim 13.

Independent Claim 18 is a corresponding method claim of independent Claim 13 and has been amended in the manner similar to Claim 13. Accordingly, the above-discussion applied to amended independent Claim 13 is also applicable to amended Claim 18.

In view of the above, the present invention as set forth in each of the amended independent Claims 13 and 18 is patentably distinct over the cited references, so that those claims as well as the dependent claims as now presented are allowable, wherefore Applicant solicits the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3939.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Krause/

John A. Krause
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1769956v1